



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE GERUNDIAL CONSTRUCTION
IN THE ROMANIC LANGUAGES, II.

We have now to speak of the Provençal and French, which have been reserved for the last, because they belong to a special category, in that they have departed more widely from the parent speech than the others in their formal development, and hence have to be grouped by themselves. The Langue d'Oc preserved both the participle and the gerund of the Latin and, according to Diez's table of inflexions, the regular forms are: gerund *-an* and *en*; participle *an-s* and *en-s*; that is, the one being distinguished from the other only by the *s*. This distinction, however, was not always heeded. In fact, two of the old Provençal grammars, the "Donatz Proensals," and the "Razos de Trobar" of Raimon Vidal, make no such division in denominating the parts of the verb. The former, in speaking of the case-endings of nouns and adjectives, says: "Si cum sun li particip que finissen in *ans* uel *ens*, queu pos dire 'aquest chaul es presans, aquesta domna es presans, aquestz cauals es avinens, aquesta domna es avinens.' Mas el nominatiu plural se camia daitan que conven a dire 'aqueilh chaul sun avinen, aquelas donas sun avinens'." In two or three other places, reference is made to the participle but there is no mention, throughout the whole treatise, of the gerund. Vidal likewise observes complete silence in respect to the distinction between gerund and participle, and we may infer that the former was regarded merely as the participle minus the *s*. The early Provençal writers were evidently not aware of any difference of origin; and there was no reason why they should have been, since the oldest documents present no forms with clearer outlines than those of a more recent date.

Like the Italian dialects above illustrated, the French modeled all its gerunds on the first conjugation, but went even further than these dialects and treated the present participle in the same manner.* Burguy, who, with all his

*We must go to the oblique cases for all the forms of the participle—even for the sibilant forms *ans*, *anz*. Latin *amans* would have given, not *amans*, *amanz*, but *ames*, as *infans* gave *enfes*, while *infantem* produced *enfant*. So taking the accusative *amantem* as the norm, we should obtain analogously *amant* (later but incorrectly *aimant*). When the

short-comings, must be admitted to have been a scholar, assigns, as it seems to me, a strange reason for this. He says in this connection:

Le participe présent des quatre conjugaisons a toujours eu la flexion *ant*; on rejeta sans doute *en* (-ens) pour distinguer orthographiquement le participe de la troisième pers. pl. prés. ind. et parce que la prononciation de l'*e* devant *n* est la même que celle de l'*a*." This is making a statement in face of the fact that no such change of *e* to *a* was thought necessary, under like conditions, in Provençal. Moreover, it is not true, as is implied in the latter part of his sentence, that the participle and the third person pl. of the verb were pronounced alike. It is true that *en(t)* and *an(t)* assonate and rime with each other:

Femmes lui van detras seguen
Ploran lo van et gaimentan.

(La Passion, B. 11. 16).

Tel conseiller ne fut onques vivant
Ne plus sages homme à mon escient.

(Roman d'Aquin, l. 1612).

But in the case of the participle and the verb, there was one thing which completely distinguished the two forms to the ear, namely the tonic accent, which must have influenced the quality of the final vowels, that is, in *finissent* (verb) the last vowel would be either not heard at all or very obscurely, while in *finissent(en)*, the *e* would be a full sonorous sound.

If I may venture a suggestion myself, I would attribute the phenomenon to dialectic influence as seen in the Roman d'Aquin (trante, talant, planté, antrer, prandre, tandre, sanglant) and

flexional sibilant (*s*, *z*) was added, the dental dropped out. *Amando* (-*uni*) appears in French only as *amant* (*aimant*); there was probably, however, an intermediate form, *amand*, the sonant then going over into its corresponding surd at a time when the final consonants were still sounded, (*quando* = *quand* is nearly always *quant* in O. F.). This process of euphony (i. e. ease of utterance according to the present definition), similar to the German, was the universal custom in early French and Provençal, and hence: *b*=*p*; *g*=*c*; *d*=*t*; *v*=*f*, (preserved in modern: *grand homme*, *sang et eau*, etc., which are pronounced: *grant homme*, *sank et eau*). These changes, as a general rule, took place, whether the sonants became final through the natural growth of the words out of the Latin or through inflexion. Only in the *Passion* and a few other poems do we observe a strong opposite dialectic tendency in respect to the final *t*'s: *leved*, *anned*, *aprosmed* comforted, defended, *acusand*.

elsewhere, where the *e* of the syllable *ens*, *en*, *ente*, *ent*, has become *a*; as *laiens* (*laiens*) present, *oriant*, *chaseant*, *povreant*, and the numerals in *ante* (*quarante*, *cinquante*, *soixante*, *septante*, *octante*, *nonante*) which must have passed through *ente* in becoming *ante*. Whatever may have been the cause of this change, the fact remains indisputable: all gerunds and present participles had the same terminations (*ant*, *ans*, *ant*) and there are no traces of *ent*-forms even in the earliest monuments of the language; for, what Wilhelm Bruno says in a dissertation which he presented to the University of Rostock, in 1871, has no bearing on the question whatever. After stating that the French "adjectif verbal" comes undoubtedly from the corresponding Latin forms in *ans* and *ens*, he continues: "Die Endung *ent* ist von vornherein fast aufgegeben" and then gives *dolent*, *présent*, *omnipotent*, as though they were genuine French participles, or verbal adjectives. The absurdity of this procedure is patent on the very face of it. In the case of the last two, there were no verbs on which to form them; while *doler* gave *dolant* as its participle. He has made the mistake of confounding words taken directly from the Latin with the cognate forms founded on French models. It seems to me it would be as reasonable to call *dolent*, *omnipotent*, *obedient* participles in English.

Quite a number of these Latin participles came into French at an early date, and a few have been added from time to time (the sixteenth century was especially prolific in their introduction), but they have preserved in the majority of cases their distinctive Latin characteristics as far as form is concerned, while the French participles have all along coëxisted side by side with them. The following partial list will make plain my meaning:

FRENCH.	LATIN.
fatiguant.	fatigant.
vaquant.	vacant.
excellant.	excellent.
intriguant.	intrigant.
présidant.	président.
résidant.	résident.
affluent.	affluent.
différant.	différent.
équivalent.	équivalent.
influant.	influent.
négligeant.	négligent.

Having discussed the etymological phases, something should now be said about the apparently interminable dispute in which French grammarians have indulged regarding the terminology to be employed in speaking of the several syntactical functions discharged by these verbal forms in *ant*.

The most common designation found in the grammars is *present participle*; but this appellation seeming too general to express all the offices performed by these words, grammarians began quite early to employ other names, such as, *adjectif verbal*, *gérondif*, &c.; but unfortunately they have not united on any term, or set of terms, to be used. The Academy thinks *gérondif* a misnomer as applied to French syntax. "Gérondif," it says, se dit abusivement, dans notre langue, du participe actif, précédé de la préposition *en*, exprimée ou sousentendue." Girault-Duvivier and Bescherelle distinguish between *adjectif verbal*, *participe présent* and *gérondif*, according to their respective syntactical relations; while Diez (*Grammatik* III. pp. 256-262) terms the inflected form *participium*, the uninflected, *gerundium*. Mätzner, on the other hand, differs a little from all these in his nomenclature: "Seine Form," he says, "worin sich die lateinischen Formen auf *ans*, *ens* und *andum*, *endum* verschmolzen finden, erscheint im Satze theils unveränderlich als *gerundivisches participium*, theils als reines *Verbaladjectif*, welches fähig ist eine Feminin- und Plural-form anzunehmen."

This diversity of terminology is not of recent date; it began with the first grammarians and sprang out of the frequent confounding of the two parts of speech by the early writers, owing to the similarity of form and signification. Instance the following, where, after verbs of motion, the verbal ought to appear unchanged, as in the first example:

Autresi m'en irai, ce crei,
Cum jéo ving, tut murant de sei.
(Marie de France, B. 238. 8).

Au terme vient joians et liés.
(Flore et Blanceflor).

E ele descirad sa gunele et jetad puldre sur
son chief si s'en alad criante e plurante.
(Livre des Rois).

The same cause brought about a like confusion in Provençal :

Als faitz conoicheras las gens,
Que las paraulas van mentens.

(Le Livre de Senequa).

E la metia enans a son poder ab sas cansors
e en comtans.

(Bib. der Troub. XLII).

Antoine Oudin, tutor in Italian of Louis XIV, observing the divergence of opinion among French grammarians relative to the variability or non-variability of the verbals in *ant*, proposed in the first edition of his grammar, which appeared in 1632, to treat them as "gerondifs," whenever they retained their full verbal force. In this case they should remain uninflected. This he sets forth in these words :

Ce participe, exprimant le gerondif, ne se doit point obliger à suivre ny le genre ny le nombre du substantif antecédant : verbi gratia : la terre produisant des fruits, et non pas la terre produisante, etc.; les roys asseurent leurs estats, traittant doucement leurs subjects, et non pas : traittans doucement, etc.; les femmes se fardant gastent leurs visages et jamais se fardans, etc. Mais s'il est pur participe relatif (c'est-à-dire adjectif verbal) il faut qu'il suive le genre et le nombre dudit antecédant, comme les roys cherissants, les subjects obeyssans, les femmes attrayantes; car alors il prend la nature d'adjectif. Je trouve une exception aux temps composés du participe estant, car on dit : ces hommes estans entrez, mais ce n'est que pour le masculin, car on ne diroit pas : ces femmes estans entrées."

It is curious to observe how Vaugelas, whose "Remarques sur la langue françoise" came out fifteen years after the publication of Oudin's grammar, attempts to compound with the matter. After stating that it would be "barbare et ridicule" to say: je les ai trouvées ayantes le verre à la main and that ayans le verre à la main would not be more correct, he adds : il faut donc necessairement avoir recours au gerondif quand il s'agit du feminin, soit au singulier, soit au pluriel, et dire en l'exemple que nous avons proposé : je les ai trouvées ayant le verre à la main." And again : "Donnons un exemple des participes actifs aux autres verbes : je les ai trouvées beuvantes et mangeantes. Qui a jamais oüy parler comme

cela ? Il faut dire : je les ai trouvées beuvant et mangeant, au gerondif. Il y en a pourtant qui soustiennent que ce participe actif feminin ne doit pas estre banny de nostre langue, quoy que neanmoins ils demeurent d'accord que l'usage en est tres-rare et que le gerondif mis en sa place sera meilleur sans comparaison." He seems, however, not to have had a clear conscience after having delivered himself of these words, for he adds further : au moins, il est bien certain qu'estant participe n'a pas de feminin et que jamais on n'a dit estante non plus qu'ayante, au feminin.

In 1660, the Port-Royalist grammarians, Arnauld and Lancelot, following the example of Oudin and Vaugelas, declared that the present participle was never anything else but a "géron dif;" that it was consequently not susceptible of either gender or number and ought not to be declined. "Je dis que nos deux participes aimant et aimé, en tant qu'ils ont le même régime que le verbe, sont plutôt des géron difs que des participes ; car M. Vaugelas a déjà remarqué que le participe en *ant*, lorsqu'il a le régime du verbe, n'a point de féminin et qu'on ne dit point par exemple : j'ai vu une femme lisante l'Ecriture, mais lisant l'Ecriture.' Que si on le met quelquesfois au pluriel : j'ai vu des hommes lisants l'Ecriture,' je crois que cela est venu d'une faute dont on ne s'est pas aperçu, à cause que le son de *lisant* et de *lisants* est presque toujours le même, le *t* ni le *s* ne se prononçant point d'ordinaire."

This principle first enunciated by Oudin was founded in reason and was theoretically correct; and had he gone back to the earliest writers, he would have found it pretty well substantiated and obtained better results than he did, as far as the history of the language was concerned. As it was, his statement was not justified by the facts as he found them at his time; and there is little doubt but that he was led to make it by the beautiful system of the Italian gerund and participle, whose clearness is such that it would not unlikely have induced him to wish to see it substituted for the chaotic condition of the analogous construction in his mother-tongue. But as has been said, the usage of his time only partially legitimated the principle he claimed to be estab-

lished. For from the beginning of the fourteenth century the feminine *e* and flexional *s* began to invade the province of the gerund.†

En la splendor de la tue fuildrante hanste.

(Habakkuk, III. 11. (XI. century)

E com pesante destinee.

(Benoit de Sainte More. XII. century)

La chiere blanche plus que n'est flour de lis

Et revelante comme rose de pris.

(Roman d'Aquin, l. 310. XII. century.)

L'espee a çainte tranchante a son coste.

(Ditto l. 1202.)

Parmi le cors li vait bruianee,

De l'autre part fiert en la lande.‡

(Gormuud et Isembard, l. 75. XIII. cent.)

The confusion having been once made, it went on increasing until 1679, when the Academy issued its famous decree: "La règle est faite, on ne déclina pas les participes actifs."

The reason which the members of that august body assigned for this decision, was that they were but following the example "de nos anciens, pour lesquels nous devons avoir beaucoup de considération; car ils ont toujours posé pour règle certaine que les verbes actifs n'ont pas de vrais participes mais seulement des gérondifs, qui tiennent lieu de participes, gardant le régime de leurs verbes et se joignant avec les noms masculins et féminins singuliers et pluriels, sans être déclinaibles et sans être d'aucun genre, par exemple: l'homme craignant Dieu; les hommes craignant Dieu; la femme craignant Dieu; les femmes craignant Dieu."

This seems a little like inspiration, unless we are to take the words *nos anciens* and *toujours* as very limited in meaning and application; for we have no reasons to believe that they had any very definite knowledge of Old French syntax. But what they did, although often contravened by practice, was in the main right; for they had the analogy of all the other Romance languages on their side. When we find the Italian, Spanish, Portuguese and Wallachian using the gerund in certain constructions such as:

† Sporadic instances of the feminine *e* with the participle made their appearance in the preceding centuries.

‡ In this last example the *e* has also been added to the gerund, similarly to a case already noticed. The addition of this feminine *e* must have acted as a potent cause in helping to confound the two parts of speech, already no longer distinguishable by their form.

E in umil seggio, e in un vestire schietto

Fra' suoi duci sedendo il ritrovaro.

(Tasso, Gerus. Lib. II. 60).

Llegó il cuadrillero, y como los halló hablando en tan sosegada conversacio quedó suspenso.

(Don Quijote, Part I. ch. XVII).

E tornando, achou-os outra vez dormindo.

(Marco, XIV. 40).

Şi a venită, şi ă-ă gasită dormindă.

(Marcă, XIV. 37);

that is, with the verb *to find*, there seems to be no plausible ground for regarding the French and Provençal construction as of different origin. Compare with the above the following:

Sor une grant coute vermoille

Troverent la dame s'ant.

(Chevalier au Lyon, B. 160. 18).

E qand venc un dia, Raimons del Castel Rosillon trobet passan Guillem de Cabestaing.

(Bib. der Troub. IX).

As far as possible an effort will be made in the following pages to treat the subject from this standpoint—namely to show by citations from the co-related languages what constructions ought to be considered gerundial, when speaking of French and Provençal.

This method of treatment has not been, as far as I know, proposed and no doubt will be objected to by some, especially by those who are not willing to admit the term "gerund" in French grammar, but who maintain that, inflected or uninflected, the verbal form *ant* is nothing but a participle. Little will be gained by it, I admit, as we can not now make the language over; but the distinction between gerund and participle once accepted, we see why the early authors considered themselves at liberty to add the *s* (*z*) or not. As has been said, they were probably not aware that the words in *ant* issued from more than one source—nay, possibly did not think of the subject at all, but they knew that custom had sanctioned both the use and the omission of the sibilant.

I find little relevancy in what has been so much insisted on with reference to the exigencies of the rime causing the violation of the rule; for while it is true that the so-called rule for the participle is frequently violated in the rimes, we can not lay much stress on this fact, as the non-sibilated forms are met too often out of rime and in prose, to be regarded as

mere orthographical blunders. Moreover, it is not uncommon to find the sibilant in the rimes where it is not called for and *vice versa*. And again, the argument would only hold good, in any case, for pure rime; because the assonances did not depend on the consonants, but on the vowel-element of the final strong syllable. Take the following passage from Guillaume d'Orange, a clear specimen of rime:

Li cuens Guillaumes fu iriez et dolanz,
Vivien vit qui gisoit to sanglanz,
Plus soef flere que basme ne pimens.
Sor sa poitrine tenoit ses mains croisanz;
Li sans li ist par ambedeus les flans,
Par mi le cors ot quinze plaies granz,
De la menor fust mort uns amiranz.
'Niés Vivien,' dit Guillaume li frans,
'Mar fu vo cors qui tant par iert vaillanz.

And another from the Chanson de Roland, an assonated poem:

De mun osberc en sunt remput li pan;
Plaies ai tantes es costez e es flans
De tutes parz en salt fors li clers sanes;
Trestut le cors m'en vait afeblanz:
Sempres murray, par le mien esciant.
Je suis vostre hum e vus tien à guarant;
Ne me blasmez, se je m'en vai fuant.

Innumerable instances might be cited out of rime and in prose; a few only are given:

Il est issus del bos, vint el lairis,
Galopant vait vers aus tou le cemin.
(Aiol et Mirabel).

Donc vint edrant dreitement à la mer.
Eist de la neif e vait edrant à Rome.
(St. Alexis).

Le cheval brochet, si vient poignant vers lui.
(Ch. de Roland).

Si home ocit alter e il seit cunuissant, &c.
(Lois de Guillaume le Conq.).

La voz del segnur frainanz les cedres—
La voiz del segnur entretrençant la flamme.
(Psalm XXIX.).

Trestot a pié, defendant son parti.
(Garin le Loherain).

Plorant li bese le piz et la forcele.
(Guil. d'Orange).

Je vois querant tun prû, t'honor.
(Myst're d'Adam).

Mult par lu vait criant merci.
(Tristan).

Qui tostens va sivant amor.
(Benoît de Sainte More).

Quant je ving ça corrant a toi.
(Ditto).

Parlant les a issi menez au cors.
(Romania VIII. 177).

Dolanz m'en part,
(Romances, thirteenth century).
Vers Castres s'en repairet joians et esbaudis.
(Le Siège de Castres (Rom. Stud. I. 591).

Et en tel estat fesoient le silence attendans
le jour qui vint tantost.

(Jehan Froissart).

C'est une cité de la marine qui siet en la
terre de Fenice et est obeissant à la cité de
Sur.

(Tr. de Guil. de Tyr.).

.... un povres hons fuioit mont criant
devans un ors.

(Ditto).

Je servirai desirans toute voie.
(Guiot de Provins).

E la metia enans a son poder ab sas cansos
e en comtans.

(Bib. der Troub.).

Non posc mudar, bels amics, qu'en chan-
tanz, &c.

(Ugo Catola).

The above quotations, which might be increased to any number, will suffice to show that verbals in *ant* might remain unchanged or take the sibilated forms *ans*, *anz*. I do not believe this is attributable to a mere whim or accident. There must have been a reason for it.

For the sake of convenience the same terminology, as that of Diez, had been determined upon, even before consulting him on the subject; and the writer was glad to have his resolution sanctioned by such an authority. But before proceeding to the syntax, another point must be mentioned, which comes properly under this heading; that is, the compound forms of the gerund.

Having created this special construction from the simple gerund (for it differs in so many ways from the Latin, that it may almost be said to be a new creation), the Romanic languages went further and constructed a past tense as well as a passive voice, by means of the auxiliary verbs *habere* and *essere*: Fr. *ayant aimé*, *étant aimé*, *ayant été aimé*; It. *avendo amato*, *essendo amato*, *essendo stato amato*; Sp. *habiendo amado*, *siendo amado*, *habiendo sido amado*; Port. *tendo (havendo) amado*, *sendo amado*, *tendo sido amado*.

In this way they remedied what we feel to be a weakness in the parent speech, which had no perfect active participle, and not having, strictly speaking, any auxiliary verbs, was obliged to make the passive participle serve

for both present and past. The Roman could not literally say: Cæsar having crossed the bridge attacked the enemy, but: Cæsar, the bridge crossed, attacked enemy. French, Césâr ayant passé le pont attaqua l'ennemi, or retaining the Latin construction: Césâr, le pont passé, attaqua l'ennemi, or even: Césâr passant le pont attaqua l'ennemi; It. Cesare avendo passato il ponte attaccò l'inimico, or: Cesare, passato il ponte, attaccò, &c., or: Cesare passando il ponte attaccò l'inimico. And so in the other languages, the Wallachian excepted, which seems to make the simple forms serve for all moods and tenses. I say this with some hesitancy, basing my belief on the silence of Diez, Barciană, Mircesco and others and on my own observation, which, it is true, is not very great in Wallachian literature. A number of parallel passages in the Bible show that, where the most of the other languages use the compound tense or some other equivalent, the Wallachian renders the same by the simple gerund. At any rate my experience is sufficiently extensive to justify me in asserting that the compound, if it occurs at all, is very exceptional.

SAMUEL GARNER.

Indiana University.

ANGLO-SAXONICA.

þ.

Just one year ago, cf. 'M. L. NOTES' I. p. 88, I argued the undesirability of expanding this MS. sign in critical editions, and showed that so far from representing merely *þæt*, it might stand for *þa*, *þæs*, *þone* (or *þam*, *þan*), *þio* and *þe*. My reference to *þ mycele gylþ*, Blickl. 53/21 did not pass unchallenged. Sievers immediately called my attention privately to the accusative *ðæt idelgielp* Past. 457/23, *on suelic gielp* 71/1 as evidences of the word being—sporadically at least—neuter. Not to speak of *þ mycele* itself, where the *-e* is neuter inflexion. Kluge also wrote: "Ihr Artikel über *þ* enthält gewiss richtige Beobachtung u. ich gestehe dass ich bisher bei der Lectüre hie u. da (ohne mir Notizen darüber zu machen) *þ* für Schreibfehler für *þe* gehalten habe. Auch jetzt nach Ihren Sammlungen möchte ich lieber einen Schreibfehler annehmen als Dop-

pelwertigkeit des *þ*. Ueber *gielp* findet sich eine Notiz in Cosijn II."

Sievers, Kluge, and Cosijn are a formidable trio, and nothing could be farther from my wish than to try to controvert them. But is there any need of treating this point as one which does not admit of mutual adjustment? First as to Kluge. Why may we not regard the sign *þ* as standing for two or more words of different phonetic and grammatic value? In many a manuscript, for example, the Durham Gospels, we read in the Latin the sign 7 as *et*, and in the interlinear gloss just above we read it as *and* (or *ond*). Similarly *t* is read *vel* or *oððe*. In an Irish gloss the 7 would be read *ocus*. What serious objection can there be to considering *þ* a mere convenient abbreviation for a number of monosyllabic words having the same *Anlaut* and akin in sense, as the German student of to-day in his *Heft* abbreviates *der*, *die*, *das*, *dem*, *den* to *d.*? Not to speak of *ð* used continually in the Durham Ritual for *ðurh*, *ðorh* = per.

As to *gielp* being both masculine and neuter, it would be foolish to deny the possibility. Gender is by no means the inflexible quality that modern school grammars make it. In Anglo-Saxon we find a noun varying its gender not only from dialect to dialect, and from century to century, but even on the same page of the same text! Thus, Sievers points to *ðæt idelgielp* Past. 457/23; but on the same page, line 33, is to be read *ðone gielp*; and again, 459/1. As regards the *ðæt* in 457/23 may not Sweet have erroneously expanded *þ*? I have counted the number of times that *ðæt* occurs in this connection, namely, pp. 457, 459, 461; the figures are: *ðæt* conjunction (including *ðætte* and *oððet*) 36 times; *ðæt*, pron. art., 18 times; total 54. Not once the sign *þ*. This wears an ominous look. It is too uniform, it drives one to the inference that Sweet has normalized the *þ* throughout his edition of the Pastoral. Let us bear in mind that the Pastoral was his first great undertaking, and that it was done nearly twenty years ago. Not to speak of the Oldest English Texts, which of us will hesitate to pronounce the Orosius much better work? Without finding fault with a self-sacrificing editor who has put us all under lasting obligations, may not one of his bene-